

Appl. No. : 10/649,372
Filed : August 26, 2003

REMARKS

The May 17, 2006 Office Action was based on pending Claims 2, 5–12, 17–20, 22–27, 29–40 and 48–60. By this Response, Applicant is amending Claims 2, 5, 17, 27, 29, 37, 48 and 54 and is cancelling Claims 6, 23 and 30 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 7–12, 18–20, 22, 24–26, 31–36, 38–40, 49–53 and 55–60 remain as previously presented. New Claims 61–64 have been added.

Thus, after entry of the foregoing amendments, Claims 2, 5, 7–12, 17–20, 22, 24–27, 29, 31–40 and 48–64 are pending and presented for further consideration. In view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks set forth below, Applicant submits that Claims 2, 5, 7–12, 17–20, 22, 24–27, 29, 31–40 and 48–64 are in condition for allowance.

SUMMARY OF REJECTIONS

The May 17, 2006 Office Action rejected Claims 2, 5–12, 17–27, 29–40 and 48–60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,936,527 to Isaacman et al. (“Isaacman”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,936,527 to Owens et al. (“Owens”).

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2, 5, 7–12, 17–22, 24–27, 29, 31–40 and 48–60 were rejected as being unpatentable over Isaacman in view of Owens. For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections.

Independent Claim 2

Amended independent Claim 2 recites a method for identifying a lost or stolen device. The method includes receiving input and storing data identifying devices that have been lost or stolen. The method also includes transmitting with a reader an interrogation signal to a transmitter of a detected device, authenticating the interrogation signal, and receiving with the reader identifying information from the transmitter of the detected device. The method further includes comparing the identifying information with the data identifying the lost or stolen devices so as to locate at least one of the lost or stolen devices.

Neither Isaacman, nor Owens, nor a combination thereof, teaches or suggests the method of amended Claim 2. Isaacman discloses a radio frequency document control system and method. With reference to Figure 3, the Isaacman system includes a host transceiver 14 that sequentially transmits a requested tag address at a first frequency to exciters 18 positioned about an office space. The selected exciter 18 then transmits a signal at a second frequency to tags 20, and the host transceiver 14 receives responses from the tags 20. A PC 2 then processes the data received by the host transceiver 14 to determine the location(s) of one or more documents or folders associated with the detected tags 20 (see, e.g., col. 6, line 61 – col. 7, line 41).

Isaacman does not appear to teach or suggest, alone or in combination with Owens, transmitting with a reader an interrogation signal to a transmitter of a detected device, authenticating the interrogation signal, and receiving with the same reader identifying information from the transmitter of the detected device. Rather, the host transceiver 14 of Isaacman transmits a signal directly to an exciter 18, which, in turn, communicates with nearby tags 20. The transceiver 14 then receives signals transmitted by the tags 20 to identify the location of the associated documents.

Isaacman does not teach or suggest the tags 20 authenticating signals received from the exciter 18. The tags 20 merely transmit a modulated signal based on, and in response to, the signals received from the exciter (see, e.g., col. 7, lines 10–40). Furthermore, the system of Isaacman does not appear to have any reason to incorporate authentication in its method of identifying documents.

Owens is directed to a lost baggage and claim system. In particular, Owens teaches inputting into a computer system information regarding claim requests and the contents of unclaimed baggage. Owens also discloses the using video data to assist in matching the unclaimed baggage with the appropriate baggage claim. Owens does not teach or suggest, alone or in combination with Isaacman, transmitting with a reader an interrogation signal to a transmitter of a detected device, authenticating the interrogation signal, and receiving with the same reader identifying information from the transmitter of the detected device.

Appl. No. : 10/649,372
Filed : August 26, 2003

Because the cited art does not teach or suggest each element of amended independent Claim 2, Applicant asserts that amended Claim 2 is patentably distinguished from the cited art and respectfully requests allowance of amended Claim 2.

Independent Claims 17, 27, 37, 48 and 54

Each of amended independent Claims 17, 27, 37, 48 and 54 is believed to be patentably distinguished over the cited art for reasons similar to those set forth with respect to the patentability of independent Claim 2 and for the different aspects recited therein.

For example, with respect to independent Claim 54, the cited art does not teach or suggest transmitting an interrogation signal directly from a transceiver to a radio frequency identification (RFID) device associated with an item and receiving with the same transceiver information transmitted by the RFID device in response to receiving the interrogation signal. Rather, as discussed above, Isaacman appears to teach a two-tiered process in which a first signal is sent at a first frequency from the host transceiver 14 to exciters 18. The selected exciter 18 then transmits a signal at a second frequency to tags 20, and the host transceiver 14 receives responses from the tags 20.

Dependent Claims 5, 7–12, 18–22, 24–26, 29, 31–36, 38–40, 49–53 and 55–60

Claims 5 and 7–12 depend from amended independent Claim 2 and are believed to be patentably distinguished over the cited art for the reasons set forth above and for the additional features recited therein.

Claims 18–20, 22, 24–26 and 58 depend from amended independent Claim 17 and are believed to be patentably distinguished over the cited art for the reasons set forth above and for the additional features recited therein.

Claims 29 and 31–36 depend from amended independent Claim 27 and are believed to be patentably distinguished over the cited art for the reasons set forth above and for the additional features recited therein.

Appl. No. : 10/649,372
Filed : August 26, 2003

Claims 38–40 depend from amended independent Claim 37 and are believed to be patentably distinguished over the cited art for the reasons set forth above and for the additional features recited therein.

Claims 49–53, 59 and 60 depend from amended independent Claim 48 and are believed to be patentably distinguished over the cited art for the reasons set forth above and for the additional features recited therein.

Claims 55–57 depend from amended independent Claim 54 and are believed to be patentably distinguished over the cited art for the reasons set forth above and for the additional features recited therein. For example, the Office Action provides no support for why it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to use encryption with the system of Isaacman. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the disclosure of Isaacman does not suggest a reason to use encryption in its document control system.

NEW DEPENDENT CLAIMS 61–64

New dependent Claims 61–64 have been added to more fully define Applicant's invention and are believed to be fully distinguished over the cited art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested. If further issues remain, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned such that any remaining issues may be promptly resolved.

Moreover, by the foregoing amendments and remarks no admission is made that any of the above-cited references are properly combinable. Rather, Applicant submits that even if the references are combined, the references still do not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

Appl. No. : 10/649,372
Filed : August 26, 2003

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 8/16/2006

By: Christian A. Fox

Christian A. Fox
Registration No. 58,507
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404